



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,108	01/08/2001	Jorg Bruss	027559-039	5345

27045 7590 03/10/2004

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR C11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,108

Applicant(s)

BRUSS, JORG

Examiner

Tu X Nguyen

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 17-19, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16 and 20-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 17-19, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/4/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reason of claim rejection 112 first paragraph below.
2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter "multicall capacity" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2684

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-10, 12-13, 17-19 and 33-34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lopez Torres (US Patent 6,144,647).

Regarding claim 1, Lopez Torres discloses a method for exchanging multicall capabilities between user equipment and a network in a radiocommunication system comprising the steps of:

receiving, from said user equipment to said network, multicall capability information associated with said user equipment (see col.6 lines 33-36);

calculating, in said network, multicall limit information based on said multicall information associated with said user equipment and multicall information associated with said network (see col.6 lines 1-19, "mapping" corresponds to "calculating"); and

returning, to said user equipment, said multicall information (see col.17 lines 50-61, "negotiation" reads on "returning" with broadest reasonable interpretation).

Regarding claim 2, Lopez Torres discloses said network includes a mobile switching center and a radio network controller, each of which perform functions associated with radiocommunication support of said user equipment (see col.2 lines 27-57), said method further comprising the steps of:

determining multicall capability information associated with said RNC (see col.2 lines 45-57, "BSC" corresponds to "RNC"); and

Using said multicall capability information associated with said RNC to calculate said multicall limit information (see col.17 lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 3 and 19, Lopez Torres discloses receiving an indication of a maximum number of bearers supported by said user terminal (see col.12 lines 16-25), "number of sets of bearer capabilities" reads on "maximum number".

Regarding claim 4, Lopez Torres discloses receiving a value associated with at least one parameter from which a maximum number of bearers supported by said user terminal can be determined (see col.16-17).

Regarding claims 5 and 8, Lopez Torres discloses transmitting said multical capability information associated with said RNC for storage in an RNC limits storage unit (see col.2 lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 6, Lopez Torres discloses said RNC storage unit is collocated with said MSC (see fig.2).

Regarding claim 7, Lopez Torres discloses storing said multical limit information in a storage unit within said user equipment (see col.15 lines 24 through col.16 line 25). It is inherently that the mobile station comprising storing unit in order transmit and negotiating to network of its mobile identification service and mobile bearer capability information.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 12-13, Lopez Torres discloses receiving said multical capability information after the transmission of a location updating request message (see col.2 lines 31-42).

Regarding claims 17-18, Lopez Torres discloses everything as claim 1 above. More specifically, Lopez Torres discloses "determining a change in said multical

capabilities has occurred in said user equipment" (see col.17 lines 50-60), "negotiation number of mobile bearer capabilities" reads on "change".

Regarding claim 33, Lopez Torres discloses a computer program in a node of a radiocommunication system (see col.2 lines 42-43).

Regarding claim 34, Lopez Torres disclose a computer program in user equipment (see col.17 lines 50-60 and col.13 lines 1-5). It is inherently the mobile station is computer program in capable functions such as simultaneously transfer data and speech.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lopez Torres and further in view of Spartz et al. (US Patent 6,178,337).

Regarding claim 11, Lopez Torres fails to disclose CLASSMARK 2 information in location updating request message.

Spartz et al. disclose CLASSMARK 2 information in location updating request message (see col.16 lines 40-45 and col.24 lines 24-30). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2684

the system of Lopez Torres with the above teaching of Spartz et al. in order to provide negotiation interface CDMA wireless service and GSM networks.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MAUNG NAY A, can be reached at (703) 308-7749.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

TN

3/04/04

NAY MAUNG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER